



3: Re-imagining Shoreham Cement Works

Response counts

Section	Count
Comments received	5
Question 3: Should development be restricted to previously developed areas?	88
Question 4: Would you like to see materials on site re-used or re-cycled for construction?	92
Question 5: How far do you think the new buildings should reflect the height and massing of the existing buildings?	99
Question 6: Would you prefer a contemporary or traditional approach to architectural design or a mixture of both?	100
Question 7: What type of public space, such as public squares, pocket parks and skateboard parks, would you like to see and why?	100

Comments received

(R32/session 60873; Brighton & Hove Schools Wellbeing Service)
Created August 2nd 2022

Having recently read this article (https://www.sussexexpress.co.uk/news/people/derelict-south-downs-cementworks-fresh-plea-for-views-3757219?fbclid=IwAR0NtI51pTcQ0ertmuPfOtpKtSgrPdbJwqSJ3dMbNhiUmVF_lxcLp4uEjuM) I am contacting you now to offer a few views, on the need for "...conserving and enhancing the natural beauty and cultural heritage and creating new jobs".

(R31/session 60872; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

We already have 'sardine' housing developments around us, crammed in to tiny areas with no natural gardens or adequate parking. Any development that incorporates housing, will not do justice to this potentially great opportunity.

(R37/session 60878; Mid Sussex District Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

Mid Sussex District Council ('the Council') welcomes the opportunity to comment on the consultation the South Downs National Park Authority's (SDNPA) Issues and Options version of the Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan (the draft AAP). Optimal use of the site's potential The Council supports the reasoning and conclusions of the SDNPA assessment of major development in respect of paragraph 177 of the NPPF and policy SD3 of your Local Plan in demonstrating exceptional circumstances for major redevelopment of the former Cement Works. Equally, the Council supports a landscape led approach to the sites redevelopment and the following comments are made with this in mind. Clearly, the Cement Works offers an exciting opportunity for the SDNPA. As noted in the draft AAP, the site is one of the largest brownfield sites in the south of England and in accordance with chapter 11 (Making effective use of land) of the NPPF, sensitive redevelopment which optimises the site's potential, whilst safeguarding and improving the environment. This will help deliver much needed local housing whilst relieving pressure on other less suitable greenfield sites in the area. The draft AAP sets out a thorough assessment of the site characteristics and constraints along with establishing initial landscape led design principles. The Council acknowledges that this site is constrained by several environmental sensitivities which will impact how it can be redeveloped and recognises that viability considerations will be a constraint. However, the draft AAP does not articulate a clear vision for redevelopment and the Council objects to some elements as they risk the site's potential not being fully realised, which will be to the detriment of creating a sustainable development. It is vital the draft AAP sets out a clear vision with well-defined design principles to ensure the redevelopment is a success.

(R72/session 60917; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

As a local resident I am so strongly opposed to the proposals made. We have to keep our precious chalk land and cultural heritage. Once it's gone we will never get it back. The cement works(along with Anchor Bottom) can be developed in a way that meets the needs of the community and commercial by seeing it through a different lense; the lense of 'wildlife place' which could generate income & work opportunities through tourism and via local and county beautiful place to visit; via education and research opportunities. It could become a ' beacon, a jewel in the crown area of chalkland and ' NOT' another man made commercial, housing and leisure complex.

(R36/session 60877; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

I find it unacceptable that large-scale development of the site described in the AAP should be contemplated as it would have a devastating affect on the whole local area.

Question 3: Should development be restricted to previously developed areas?

(R206/session 53526; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Mostly

(R214/session 53542; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

No

(R196/session 53606; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

No

(R197/session 53690; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Yes

(R208/session 53703; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Yes

(R154/session 53708; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

No. The moonscape area should be developed too.

(R181/session 54012; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

no

(R90/session 54020; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

Yes

(R112/session 54076; member of public)
Created June 11th 2022

Rewild this site as the SDNP is so wildlife depleted. No housing, no shops, just wildlife.

(R94/session 54186; member of public)
Created **June 13th 2022**

Access to these areas must be considered particularly those who live in close proximity - I wouldn't like to see local housing disappearing close to the site, simply for development.

(R142/session 54348; member of public)
Created **June 14th 2022**

Don't know what this means

(R166/session 54370; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

Mostly yes, as much natural area left as possible

(R216/session 54416; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

No

(R78/session 54414; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

No. The focus should be on maximising the number of homes on the site. Small houses and flats rather than large executive houses.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)
Created **June 16th 2022**

No the whole site should be considered suitable for development to ensure the best possible result.

(R119/session 54505; member of public)
Created **June 17th 2022**

No

(R209/session 54553; member of public)
Created **June 19th 2022**

yes

(R145/session 54557; member of public)
Created **June 19th 2022**

No, redevelopment should be expanded to include tourist access via Hovercraft along the river from a rail junction at Shoreham airport; this would relieve road congestion associated with visitor vehicle access.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)
Created **June 21st 2022**

Yes

(R129/session 54811; member of public)
Created **June 23rd 2022**

yes

(R139/session 54943; member of public)
Created **June 24th 2022**

Yes. There is plenty of space without encroaching on undeveloped areas

(R173/session 54989; member of public)
Created **June 25th 2022**

Yes

(R186/session 55093; member of public)
Created **June 28th 2022**

Not necessarily. I think the development should be fit for purpose rather than restricted, although it is already a massive site so I would hope whatever comes next could be within the borders of the existing area.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)
Created **June 29th 2022**

Yes we believe it should. This is to allow nature to flourish.

(R117/session 55250; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

Yes

(R205/session 55260; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

Yes

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created **July 4th 2022**

Yes

(R74/session 55269; member of public)
Created **July 4th 2022**

Yes

(R179/session 55304; member of public)
Created **July 5th 2022**

Not necessarily. If work outside the boundaries are needed to make the area safe (cliffs)

(flooding) then this must be considered.

(R149/session 55308; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

Yes, it's a big enough space as it is.

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

No

(R183/session 55368; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Yes, as we're in the South Downs national park and the downsland should be protected

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Yes

(R169/session 55398; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Yes, the site is large enough by itself for development, without encroaching on green space.

(R133/session 55416; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Yes

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

Yes, impact on the environment should be limited to previously developed land

(R176/session 56372; member of public)
Created July 16th 2022

Less than previously developed. Give back to nature

(R140/session 55534; member of public)
Created July 17th 2022

Preferably.

(R136/session 56490; member of public)
Created July 18th 2022

No - consideration should be given to whether any planned development would benefit from development of adjacent areas to maximise the overall improvement (e.g. the area

north of the cement works, south/southeast of existing houses along the road, also e.g. either side of the road to the south of the proposed roundabout).

(R107/session 56637; member of public)
Created July 19th 2022

Yes, although some development (non-residential) within the Bowl might be appropriate if this makes the site as a whole more viable. The Clifflands and Moonscape should not be developed and should be used to encourage ecological development to encourage biodiversity.

(R207/session 56817; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

I personally, don't think so!

(R141/session 56885; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

There is room for appropriate development in all areas of the site.

(R168/session 56899; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

The Riverside and Cement Works areas should be the main focus of any development. The Bowl, as it also has some industrial buildings could also be used for sensitively designed structures. The Moonscape provides a unique opportunity to allow this area of land to revert to a 'natural state' and should be kept free from development - this would help to minimise its current high visual impact on the landscape.

(R159/session 56908; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

yes

(R152/session 56938; member of public)
Created July 24th 2022

yes

(R182/session 57984; Kingsley Parish Council, Hampshire)
Created July 25th 2022

No if a better use can be found for connected areas

(R79/session 56961; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

yes

(R195/session 56984; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Yes, unless bowl can feasibly developed.

(R174/session 56998; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

No

(R101/session 56990; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Not necessarily

(R212/session 57028; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Yes

(R184/session 57024; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

This is rather a loaded, leading question, not an open one allowing for options for a genuine enhanced landscape. "Re-imagining / Vision / exemplary / sustainable", dynamic and encouraging words, but the reality of allowing mixed use or any permanent development will over time be added to and will not achieve "a substantially enhanced landscape". This is far from compatibility with NP Purposes and is not "appropriate to its setting within a national park".

(R103/session 56917; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

The whole area should be considered for development of some kind. For example warehousing could be considered for the Moonscape but each building would have extensive solar panels and rainwater collection and recycling facilities. The Bowl might be developed as a leisure and landscape area; the Cement Works for employment and housing and the Riverside for housing.

(R221/session 57159; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

No

(R116/session 57216; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

Yes

(R211/session 57853; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

Development should be considered for the WHOLE site.

(R192/session 57319; member of public)
Created July 28th 2022

yes

(R84/session 57491; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

yes

(R128/session 57501; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Yes

(R165/session 57543; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Yes

(R99/session 57553; Findon Parish Council)
Created July 29th 2022

3. Development should be restricted to previously developed areas

(R132/session 57586; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Careful consideration should be given to any development beyond the existing boundary.

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

No, but care must be taken to leave some areas as they are now to show the original landscape. Also, if possible, the tall chimney.

(R137/session 57747; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Yes, the undeveloped land should be regenerated as a National Park.

(R115/session 57760; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Yes

(R77/session 57764; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

All of the site was once a developed area so all could be open for development

(R82/session 57785; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

Yes

(R76/session 57798; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

I don't think you should be developing this site at all. Manage its decline & rewild.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)

Created **July 31st 2022**

Yes. Building on greenfield areas is a definite no

(R220/session 57858; member of public)

Created **July 31st 2022**

Yes

(R200/session 57897; member of public)

Created **July 31st 2022**

Against all development, this road is far too busy, a construction site here would cause years of misery for people in the villages as it's the only viable route into Shoreham

(R130/session 57941; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

yes

(R87/session 57957; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Yes

(R158/session 57982; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

yes

(R143/session 57986; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

No. It should be also extended into the Bowl.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Yes

(R162/session 57996; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Yes

(R69/session 60913; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

open minded, changes in land use and comentaing habitat should not be ruled out

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)
Created August 2nd 2022

This is no place for a new housing estate or development unconnected with the National Park. Arguably the most important challenges to all our futures is the rate of climate change, our continuing war on nature, the desperate need for nature recovery and increased biodiversity. This cleaned up space would enable the creation of a hub where through education, leadership and example, Park users and the public at large could better appreciate these challenges and contribute more effectively to their and others' health and well-being. While presumably a key SDNPA resource and visitor centre, it offers a focus for studying the history of the flora and fauna, the settlement, farming and industries of the South Downs, it could provide a setting to show how to live with 'a lighter step on the earth', the circular economy and therefore a 'greener', less wasteful, fuller existence. Current routes to the sustainability of the SDNP should be an immediate rallying point.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)
Created August 2nd 2022

Yes we believe it should. This is to allow nature to flourish.

(R20/session 60856; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

The Shoreham gap currently is unique in that it doesn't have much development. And there's an opportunity to hide any new development behind the existing facade on the east side. Which could allow the west side to be remediated. I would be wary about inviting urban sprawl along the Adur. And would invite much of the estuary and surrounding fields to be turned over to flood plain and wetlands, which could create a bird and wildlife sanctuary. I wouldn't like to see the entire site be redeveloped with buildings. Rather just the area where there is the existing large abandoned building. I could see opportunity in the Moonscape section, and outer areas to be planted with trees/shrubs etc. Something like sweet chestnut etc, and other edibles. Which would smooth the existing scar and provide some parkland and an edible landscape. The chalk downs are unique, home to precious chalk grasslands and clear springs/aquifers. The chalk should be celebrated and utilised and waters protected.

(R50/session 60893; SDNPA Specialists Team)
Created August 2nd 2022

Yes.

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

Development should be considered for the WHOLE site.

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

The Council supports the principle of utilising previously developed land which relates to the areas classed as 'Riverside' and 'Cement Works'. The Council acknowledges the viability cost implications associated with bringing forward development on a brownfield site of this scale especially to address satisfactory remediation requirements. Whilst the Council recognises that the option of redeveloping the Riverside would yield the most profitable area to build homes, the Council does have some comments concerning 1 landscape and flooding / flood risk and these are made in response to Question 8 and Question 14 respectively. With regards to the area classed as 'The Bowl' (greenfield) it is noted that the Issues and Options document identifies the potential to build lightweight commercial buildings that could be accommodated on the contaminated land area that would generate value for the site. In addition, it is noted that The Bowl along with the greenfield area classed as 'The Moonscape', provides an opportunity for recreation and tourism such as zip lines, mountain biking or toboggans that could be fairly hidden inside the wider landscape. Should these development options be developed further, the Council would wish to ensure that such proposed uses will not result in the introduction of new structures that could be visually harmful to the setting of the National Park and that any future proposals include an assessment of any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated. The Council supports the design principle that the areas classed as 'The Clifflands' shall remain largely undeveloped. However, it is noted within the opportunities section in paragraph 4.25 that there is an opportunity to highlight the sensitivity and value of this area for educational purposes. Whilst it is recognised that this is an Issues and Options Stage, should the concept of education be developed further, the Council would encourage clarification on what this entails i.e. educational walking trails or involves building for an educational use such as a visitors centre.

(R11/session 60846; Cyrrus Brighton City Airport)

Created August 2nd 2022

Brighton City Airport has no issues with future developments being developed outside of the existing developed areas. However, it will be paramount that any such development should be subject to an Aerodrome Safeguarding assessment to ensure there would be no operational impact to the airport.

(R23/session 60863; Hampshire County Council: Economy, Transport, Environment)

Created August 2nd 2022

2.0) Built Development on the Site (Question 3: Should development be restricted to previously developed areas?) 2.1) Limiting development to certain parts of the site: The principle of concentrating development of previously developed parts of the site in line with Local Plan policy is supported. It should enable protection and restoration of areas of the most ecologically and visually sensitive parts of the site. The Landscape Study suggests that 'Riverside' and 'the Cement Works' which are considered brownfield sites should be the focus of development. In chapter 5, 'Summary and Design Principles' it says: 'Keeping development compact within existing developed areas would alleviate visual and landscape character impacts.' 2.5) Site E- 'Clifflands':

(R127/session 53652; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

I think development should be in areas that will not disturb wildlife or biodiversity. If development can be linked to these special features that would be excellent. I think when the development was established before, the National Park itself was not established.

(R224/session 58050; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

Yes

Question 4: Would you like to see materials on site re-used or recycled for construction?

(R206/session 53526; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

If possible

(R214/session 53542; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Yes

(R196/session 53606; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Yes

(R197/session 53690; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Recycled, there's brilliant examples in Germany of rewilding industrial spaces like this.

(R208/session 53703; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Yes

(R154/session 53708; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Only if it doesn't slow down or impair the development of as much housing as possible.

(R203/session 53949; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

Yes

(R181/session 54012; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

where possible, yes

(R90/session 54020; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

Yes where it is economically viable to do so, and if they are not contaminated. Whatever scheme is chosen will only be developed if it is economically viable for all partners

(R112/session 54076; member of public)

Created **June 11th 2022**

Re-used in the rewinding of this site where appropriate.

(R94/session 54186; member of public)

Created **June 13th 2022**

Yes, where possible.

(R142/session 54348; member of public)

Created **June 14th 2022**

Yes

(R166/session 54370; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

yes

(R216/session 54416; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

If possible

(R78/session 54414; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

Not necessary. The prime factor for choice of materials should be minimising construction costs for new housing.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)

Created **June 16th 2022**

Where possible (with costs taken into account)

(R119/session 54505; member of public)

Created **June 17th 2022**

Yes, if viable. It would be nice to add to the story

(R209/session 54553; member of public)

Created **June 19th 2022**

re-cycled

(R145/session 54557; member of public)

Created **June 19th 2022**

Re-use materials for site construction

(R164/session 54096; member of public)

Created **June 21st 2022**

Yes

(R129/session 54811; member of public)
Created **June 23rd 2022**

yes

(R139/session 54943; member of public)
Created **June 24th 2022**

Yes, definitely

(R173/session 54989; member of public)
Created **June 25th 2022**

Yes

(R186/session 55093; member of public)
Created **June 28th 2022**

Yes, the development should try to re-use or re-purpose existing materials where possible in keeping with the circular economy, although having been left to rot for so long it could only ever be a 'where possible' situation.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)
Created **June 29th 2022**

Yes we would like to see reuse on site as much as possible with recycling for materials that cannot be used as part of the development

(R117/session 55250; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

Yes

(R205/session 55260; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

Yes

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created **July 4th 2022**

Yes

(R74/session 55269; member of public)
Created **July 4th 2022**

Yes

(R179/session 55304; member of public)
Created **July 5th 2022**

Obviously if this is possible it would make sense and reduce carbon footprint moving spoil from the site.

(R149/session 55308; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

Yes. It would be nice to keep some of the buildings, and, or the materials in any new construction

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

Yes but not in the south east of England

(R183/session 55368; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Yes, but only if this makes sense from a sustainability POV, i.e. if recycling of materials actually reduces the environmental impact of construction

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Yes

(R169/session 55398; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

It would be a good solution to save new materials wherever possible.

(R133/session 55416; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Yes

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

As much as possible should be reused and recycled.

(R176/session 56372; member of public)
Created July 16th 2022

Where possible. Asbestos removal worries me. I would like to see a robust plan for removal and the developers held to account

(R140/session 55534; member of public)
Created July 17th 2022

Where possible.

(R136/session 56490; member of public)

Created July 18th 2022

Modern, energy efficient, and visually/environmentally materials should be used. If that can include reuse/recycle of existing materials - then great.

(R107/session 56637; member of public)

Created July 19th 2022

Yes

(R187/session 56735; member of public)

Created July 20th 2022

As much as possible if complementing local materials.

(R75/session 56810; member of public)

Created July 21st 2022

Yes if possible

(R207/session 56817; member of public)

Created July 21st 2022

Absolutely, the chimney to represent the Pirates ship's main mast. Inside the buiding (photography by Jody Doherty-Cove) there seems to be an abundant of reuseable material or either construction or added architecture features for the Pirate Ship. The large pipe could be used as an underground water bunker to reserve rain water.

(R141/session 56885; member of public)

Created July 22nd 2022

Certainly not - there is no value to be gained from any of them - it is difficult to see any "industrial heritage" value there.

(R168/session 56899; member of public)

Created July 23rd 2022

As far as is practicable, the re-use of materials already on-site is a sustainable approach, reducing the need for imported materials to some extent.

(R159/session 56908; member of public)

Created July 23rd 2022

materials should be left where they are wherever possible and imaginatively re-used where removed. construction of new buildings should be kept to an absolute minimum

(R152/session 56938; member of public)

Created July 24th 2022

yes

(R182/session 57984; Kingsley Parish Council, Hampshire)

Created July 25th 2022

If possible, but only if it does not incurring too much extra cost

(R79/session 56961; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

yes if possible

(R195/session 56984; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Both as appropriate. Use in place if practical.

(R174/session 56998; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Yes if possible

(R101/session 56990; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Yes, if possible

(R212/session 57028; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Not if industrial heritage is destroyed

(R184/session 57024; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

New developments in the neighbouring area could and should use the recycled materials when the derelict buildings at the old cement works are demolished.

(R103/session 56917; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

Some foundation slabs might be reusable but much would have to be recycled and removed from the site.

(R221/session 57159; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

Yes

(R116/session 57216; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

yes

(R211/session 57853; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

Where possible, certain elements have a historical and architectural significance and could

be re-used in the development to maintain some of the original character and features of the site where practical.

(R156/session 57287; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

Yes, reuse as much as possible

(R192/session 57319; member of public)
Created July 28th 2022

yes

(R84/session 57491; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

yes

(R128/session 57501; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Yes, if this is possible

(R165/session 57543; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

100% it's a given considering current condition of climate change and need for netzero. Any thing less would be a failure. Passivehaus a given as is natural materials.

(R99/session 57553; Findon Parish Council)
Created July 29th 2022

4. Materials on site should be re-used or re-cycled for construction wherever possible.

(R132/session 57586; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Only as foundations!

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

If and where possible but not to construct buildings. If not, maybe 'safe' hardcore.

(R137/session 57747; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Yes.

(R115/session 57760; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

Recycled and reused

(R77/session 57764; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

Yes if possible

(R82/session 57785; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

No. And I see no benefit in retaining any of the existing structures including the chimney.

(R76/session 57798; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

I don't think you should be developing this site at all. Manage its decline & rewild.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)

Created **July 31st 2022**

Yes as long as it's done sympathetically

(R130/session 57941; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

yes

(R87/session 57957; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Both

(R163/session 57979; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Re-use in redevelopment would be preferred where possible

(R158/session 57982; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

yes

(R143/session 57986; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Where possible obviously both. In reality there are very little materials other than the concrete structure (which can be crushed to use as foundation material) which can be re-used on site. Materials which can be recycled offsite obviously should be. But in reality, the costs of removing the current asbestos filled structures are high and so there needs to be an element of pragmatism to ensure that the cost of demolition and clearing the site does

not kill the whole scheme.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Yes

(R162/session 57996; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Yes

(R69/session 60913; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

essential subject to safety - embedded carbon is an issue as well as minimising construction truck movements

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

All and every attempt must be made to decarbonise development which will potentially see materials reused, recycled, possibly conserved, alongside new materials and approaches.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Yes we would like to see reuse on site as much as possible with recycling for materials that cannot be used as part of the development

(R20/session 60856; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Pines Calyx is an example of a project that utilises chalk to make a rammed chalk/earth community building. I would like to see chalk and flint used.

(R50/session 60893; SDNPA Specialists Team)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Yes. They should be re-used to reduce carbon emissions.

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Where possible, certain elements have a historical and architectural significance and could be re-used in the development to maintain some of the original character and features of the site where practical.

(R67/session 60911; Whaleback)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Yes - there will be a vast amount of embodied carbon on site which must be considered for retention or re-use wherever possible. The hierarchy of waste dictates that retention and re-use, then recycling, should be considered before removal. There is also a cultural

heritage component to some of the structures which warrant retention in their own right.

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

Adur District Council has declared a climate emergency and thus recognises the importance of operating within a circular economy model by way of reducing embodied carbon impacts from development. If existing buildings can be retained, development should seek to retrofit energy and carbon reduction measures (where feasible) rather than demolish and re-build them. It is also possible to minimise the use of resources through reducing waste, minimising materials required, and using materials with a low embodied carbon content. This could be achieved by focusing on the sustainable (re)use of existing materials as far as possible before considering introducing new materials. However, it is acknowledged that some existing buildings on the site have contamination issues as well as asbestos-cement cladding walls being present. It is understood that there is a potential demolition risk associated with the extent/thickness of slabs and foundations. Whilst the Council is generally supportive of the principle of the re-use and recycling of existing materials, it is understood that there are exceptional circumstances surrounding this site with contamination issues needing to be addressed, and therefore the reuse or recycling of materials will not be possible across all parts of the site.

(R23/session 60863; Hampshire County Council: Economy, Transport, Environment)
Created August 2nd 2022

2.2.2) The existing buildings offer the opportunity, if re-purposed, to concentrate development rather than spreading across the site. Due to their sheer scale, conversion could go a long way towards producing sufficient floorspace to create a financially viable development. (We can see no analysis of existing floor/site areas which might be useful in evaluating this.) The benefits to the landscape of concentrating development in this way would be substantial. Not only would sensitive parts of the wider site be protected from built development, allowing them to be conserved, but the retention of the buildings would give meaning to the extraordinary landscape of the Cement Works site. 2.2.3) The option to convert and preserve the buildings in some form hasn't yet been fully explored it seems. Section 5D in the draft AAP suggests there really isn't sufficient evidence to rule out the option of retaining the most important buildings. In particular the statement in section 5.50 that 'retention of all of the historic buildings, much of which are in an extreme state of dilapidation, would increase the development costs and thus impact on viability' needs to be supported by evidence. The Landscape Study says in chapter five, Summary and Design Principles: 'Where appropriate and fit for restoration, former industrial buildings could also be retained and re-purposed to provide important references to the industrial heritage of the site' and 'New development proposals should consider the retention, adaptation and reuse of existing buildings where feasible.' 2.2.4) The site's embodied energy is mentioned in the AAP. Para. 5.74 says: 'The buildings on site, being made predominantly of concrete contain significant amounts of embodied energy and should ideally be re-used.' That applies to both the buildings and to the developed site itself which contains extensive areas of hardstanding. Para. 5.74 goes on to say: 'This is unlikely to be practical' but without referring to supporting evidence. An assessment of embodied energy would allow the benefits of retention rather than demolition to be examined. The ICE has stated that: 'It is thought that in the UK, buildings account for around 50% of the total energy consumed. The UK construction industry is the largest consumer of resources, consuming more than 400 million tonnes of material a year (ref. Davis Langdon), and this consumption of materials in itself accounts for around 10% of UK carbon emissions (ref. ENVEST from ICE).' We suggest the AAP should outline how the topic of embodied energy will be addressed going forward. Re-use and re-purposing of buildings and other structures on the site could have a profound effect on the form of development and consequently its impact on the local landscape. 2.4.5) Similarly, decisions about relocating/removing some or all of the machinery inside the buildings need to be based on a condition survey of both. It may be that creative design would allow retention of some machinery as features inside a

repurposed building or buildings. Some might be used elsewhere across the site as suggested in the Landscape Study. (Gasworks Park in Seattle is an excellent example of how industrial artefacts can be integrated into a successful and well-loved public space. Another example is Landschaftspark in Duisburg-Meiderich, Germany.)

(R127/session 53652; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Of course, re-use and recycle as much as possible!

(R223/session 58070; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Some of the aspects of historic buildings could be used to acknowledge the heritage.

(R224/session 58050; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Yes if it's in keeping with the overall design

Question 5: How far do you think the new buildings should reflect the height and massing of the existing buildings?

(R206/session 53526; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Hopefully the old building will be removed

(R214/session 53542; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Vertical expansion .. NO Lateral expansion .. YES (whilst sympathetic to local community and after consultation with local residents)

(R196/session 53606; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Below the existing height . Lower than the existing mass.

(R197/session 53690; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

If the iconic stack is being removed. Then, it shouldn't be visible - this is the same for any homes built in the park so unsure why this would change. Some height for views is fine, but as the area towards the river is somewhat flat, 2/3 stories should be ample.

(R208/session 53703; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Not necessary

(R154/session 53708; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

I don't think the buildings should be higher than the existing ones but horizontal development is great.

(R203/session 53949; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

Less mass and height, apart from a substantial leisure complex

(R181/session 54012; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

this sound ssensible.

(R90/session 54020; member of public)
Created **June 10th 2022**

All new buildings need to sit at a height inside the side, not be taller than the cliffs

(R112/session 54076; member of public)
Created **June 11th 2022**

Rewild this site as the SDNP is so wildlife depleted. No housing, no shops, just wildlife.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)
Created **June 11th 2022**

Not at all

(R94/session 54186; member of public)
Created **June 13th 2022**

Some of the existing buildings are not very sympathetic to the adjacent landscape - I would suggest that any new building should be more in keeping with the environment rather than the buildings.

(R142/session 54348; member of public)
Created **June 14th 2022**

Current buildings not really relevant. Suggest smaller.

(R166/session 54370; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

They should be similar to keep context with the sites history and maximise use to the developed space.

(R216/session 54416; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

Make use of all space

(R78/session 54414; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

Not necessary. The existing buildings have been an eyesore for decades and should not be a major factor in the design of the redevelopment.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)
Created **June 16th 2022**

Buildings should be lower in height (above sea level) than the previous structure. However I have no problem with them being taller if this is from the base of the pit, for example, but do not then reach a higher point above sea level than the existing structure.

(R119/session 54505; member of public)

Created **June 17th 2022**
Not massively

(R209/session 54553; member of public)
Created **June 19th 2022**
unnecessary

(R145/session 54557; member of public)
Created **June 19th 2022**
Not necessary to reflect previous industrial architecture

(R164/session 54096; member of public)
Created **June 21st 2022**
They should be low buildings

(R129/session 54811; member of public)
Created **June 23rd 2022**
industrial style would compliment the site

(R139/session 54943; member of public)
Created **June 24th 2022**
Not as high as existing building, but could cover similar area of land

(R173/session 54989; member of public)
Created **June 25th 2022**
Not at all

(R186/session 55093; member of public)
Created **June 28th 2022**
Ideally the new development wouldn't be higher than the existing chimney otherwise it really will be a blot on the landscape.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)
Created **June 29th 2022**
There is an opportunity to replicate the iconic chimney landmark engineered as a haven for birds such as peregrine and swift

(R108/session 55212; member of public)
Created **July 1st 2022**
As long as it is green and blended in - anything would be better than what is there!

(R172/session 55230; member of public)
Created **July 2nd 2022**

Not at all. Existing buildings not relevant to re-development.

(R117/session 55250; member of public)
Created July 3rd 2022

new buildings should be much lower to preserve open views across the Downs.

(R205/session 55260; member of public)
Created July 3rd 2022

The Riverside site could reflect the height and massing. The Cement Works building should be lower and less oppressive. The other sites should not be built on as this will negatively impact biodiversity.

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

Not at all

(R179/session 55304; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

The current buildings are an eyesore. Evening the chimney. No one is going to miss them surely.

(R149/session 55308; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

Only slightly higher, if not the same as buildings in the area.

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

No new buildings

(R183/session 55368; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

No need to keep similar proportions. I would see it as a clean slate, not Battersea power station. I think the new development could be much more in keeping with the surroundings than the cement works.

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Not at all - should be less imposing

(R169/session 55398; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Any new building should be in keeping with the original history of the site.

(R133/session 55416; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Mixture

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

The height should be kept to a minimum to not detract from the landscape.

(R176/session 56372; member of public)
Created July 16th 2022

Should be lower. The current building and chimney are visible from afar, the cliffs offer a great opportunity to disguise the development

(R140/session 55534; member of public)
Created July 17th 2022

Should not be higher than present buildings (ignoring chimney).

(R136/session 56490; member of public)
Created July 18th 2022

Generally, they should not.

(R107/session 56637; member of public)
Created July 19th 2022

I would prefer to see buildings that are at most three or four stories high on the Riverside section, although they could be taller within the Cement Works area as long as they sit within the context of the cliffs, without the buildings dominating the site

(R187/session 56735; member of public)
Created July 20th 2022

Not if they rise to the height of the chimney, if the chimney is retained. Otherwise, the height should complement other buildings in the National Park. As low rise as possible.

(R75/session 56810; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

Not at all. The existing buildings are horrible and should not be "copied" at all.

(R207/session 56817; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

I would like it to be to the same scale.

(R141/session 56885; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

The is no need to reflect any future development by height or size - this would merely re-

establish a "blot" on the Park landscape.

(R168/session 56899; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

Any large buildings would need to be sensitively designed and located, having regard to appearance from close to and from afar - such as the opposite side of the Adur Valley. It is important that the overall appearance doesn't become one of an urban landscape.

(R159/session 56908; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

the current cement works buildings should be left in situ. they are a landmark steeped in heritage and history, becoming more and more like dramatic castle ruins with each passing year. this is a unique and exciting monument. removing it would destroy much of what is special about the area, instead the evolution of the buildings into something increasingly wild and biodiverse should be supported

(R152/session 56938; member of public)
Created July 24th 2022

not important

(R182/session 57984; Kingsley Parish Council, Hampshire)
Created July 25th 2022

New building should be designed around their purpose and in keeping with the proposed new landscape.

(R79/session 56961; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

not anywhere as big or high

(R195/session 56984; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Should not be as high

(R174/session 56998; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

The buildings should mostly be demolished and smaller buildings built

(R101/session 56990; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

I think repurposing some of the existing buildings if possible and certainly the façade would be good

(R212/session 57028; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

To the extent that they give a reminder of former buildings

(R184/session 57024; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Any new buildings should be short-term only, to help pay for the removal of the old eyesore and, ideally, help fund the full restoration of the quarry (see Q1 comment).

(R103/session 56917; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

The chimney and existing buildings should be demolished and the kilns etc. sold for scrap. The new buildings should look to the future and not the past.

(R221/session 57159; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

Lower to give a better view into the site.

(R124/session 57177; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

The new buildings should be smaller in scale than the existing

(R116/session 57216; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

yes

(R211/session 57853; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

All buildings must blend in with the countryside. Any development should respect the rural setting and generally low-rise characteristics of the surrounding area.

(R156/session 57287; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

Not much

(R192/session 57319; member of public)
Created July 28th 2022

no need to be as high

(R84/session 57491; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

no

(R128/session 57501; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Because of the depth of the previous excavation height on the non river side would be ok

(R165/session 57543; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

New buildings should not replace existing and only sit on footprint of already condemned buildings. Height not a key issue as long as they are biophillic and genuinely natural in appearance and operation. The chimney and main retained building should stand out. Mass proportional to cliff surroundings and ecological zones. Correct architectural language is imperative.

(R99/session 57553; Findon Parish Council)
Created July 29th 2022

5. New buildings should not exceed the height and massing of the existing buildings.

(R132/session 57586; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Not at all. It should be required to blend into the landscape. The existing structure is of a by-gone era.

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Not at all.

(R137/session 57747; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Any new building development should reflect the history of the Cement Works' archeology, without the height of the main building and the chimney.

(R115/session 57760; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Closely

(R77/session 57764; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

They should not be higher than existing massings

(R82/session 57785; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

A far higher priority would be the coherence, utility and elegance of new structures and their interaction with the surrounding landscape.

(R76/session 57798; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

I don't think you should be developing this site at all. Manage its decline & rewild.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

The buildings should be lower

(R220/session 57858; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

Should not be above three story's high.

(R96/session 57924; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

This misses the point - it assumes a built development option which is constrained and disappointingly narrow thinking for a National Park Authority, particularly given the site is poorly located with regard to existing urban areas and will generate considerable traffic

(R126/session 57939; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

the choices are all about buildings and economic development. Yet the site provides an opportunity to recreate chalk grassland, link to Anchor Bottom and enhance the landscape.

(R130/session 57941; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

nothing higher, small scale "blocks" of building and nothing very large (like storage warehouses.)

(R87/session 57957; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Similar height and size, no bigger

(R163/session 57979; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Buildings should be designed to fit their new function rather than reflect previous usage.

(R158/session 57982; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

they should not exceed the massing of the existing buildings

(R143/session 57986; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Not at all. The new buildings should be hidden within the landscape and designed in a way

to be unobtrusive, ensuring that the users of the South Downs, particularly along the South Downs Way, are not visually drawn to the site, thereby reinstating some of the best views of the South Downs up and down the Adur Valley.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

No higher than existing

(R162/session 57996; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

None just rewild it

(R69/session 60913; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

I am not worried - I think more smaller buildings in different locations on the site will give design and development business case variety - we don't want to be over constrained

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

While retaining the chimney may be a fitting memorial to its past role, other industrial buildings present little charm or design or heritage value. Their bulk and height deserve little account in any future buildings ' design. On such a sensitive site, only buildings of high architectural quality are possible. The television programme 'Grand Designs' illustrates some examples of sensitive building in precious countryside. Recent work by the High Weald AONB creating colour charts and Pantones locally appropriate to its sense of place, may be helpful. Presumably the SDNPA's recent design guide will provide further assistance.

(R17/session 60852; Fittleworth and District Association)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Any development should be contemporary, and indeed adventurous, as design is not constrained by the need to respect existing domestic building.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

There is an opportunity to replicate the iconic chimney landmark engineered as a haven for birds such as peregrine and swift

(R20/session 60856; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

If the unique facade on the East side remains new buildings could be hidden behind if they remain lower Care would be need to be taken for any building on the west side, and would need to be exceptional.

(R50/session 60893; SDNPA Specialists Team)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Worth to maximise height and massing within developed areas, but only if building are of excellent quality and fit for uses and support compact form of development.

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

All buildings must blend in with the countryside. • Any development should respect the rural setting and generally low-rise characteristics of the surrounding area.

(R67/session 60911; Whaleback)
Created August 2nd 2022

Whilst the height and form of the existing buildings are out of keeping with the local area, they have become a local landmark over time. The perceived bulk of future buildings could be mitigated with good architecture, green roofs and landscaping. Larger buildings would yield more homes which in turn allows for other beneficial infrastructure such as community uses, tourism/educational facilities, improved highways layout, better public transport, etc. Provided that these commitments are secured effectively, we support new buildings of a similar scale to the existing structures on-site.

(R72/session 60917; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Any buildings development would be a 'carbuncle' and a travesty to our national park. So absolutely "NO" to any development

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

The Council takes the view that the redevelopment of Shoreham Cement Works could be informed by Design Codes. Given the high landscape sensitivities and the need to conserve and enhance the landscape beauty of the National Park, it is considered appropriate to set out Design Codes that are sympathetic to local character and cultural history of the Shoreham Cement Works, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. This is a vital evidence base document to guide future redevelopment at this site. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF is clear in that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. This would be an opportunity for effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

(R11/session 60846; Cyrrus Brighton City Airport)
Created August 2nd 2022

The cement works area is located within the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) and Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP's) for Brighton City Airport. These surfaces are established to protect the safe landing and taking-off of aircraft from its operational runways. The current chimney located at the site is already a known obstacle that infringes these surfaces and therefore Brighton City Airport would not want to see any new structures being built to the height of the existing chimney and would encourage that any new buildings are kept to the height of the lower structures currently on site. Brighton City Airport acknowledges that the chimney represents the sites cultural heritage and may form part of any future designs for the site. However, due to the site being derelict the chimney

is not currently lit with aviation obstacle warning lights. Therefore, If the chimney is to remain in situ and form part of the regenerated site, Brighton City Airport would ask that omni-directional obstacle warning lights are installed at the highest part of the chimney. These lights should be low-intensity Type B, 32 candelas red static lights, in accordance with CS-ADR-DSN 'Chapter Q – Visual Aids for Denoting Obstacles'. However, if the chimney is not necessary or integral to the design, then Brighton City Airport would support its removal.

(R127/session 53652; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

I think this reminds me similarly to Hawley power station in the new forest national park. I think because of the iconic nature of the tower, a similar structure in it's place would be welcomed.

(R224/session 58050; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

I think new buildings should be incorporated into the footprint of existing buildings as far as possible. If there are new/additional buildings then these should be lower in height

Question 6: Would you prefer a contemporary or traditional approach to architectural design or a mixture of both?

(R206/session 53526; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Contemporary

(R214/session 53542; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Traditional

(R196/session 53606; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Traditional Georgian style or completely futuristic with new materials. Not boring regular builds.

(R197/session 53690; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Mix of both. Examples like Poundbury as just plain odd. But you need a bloody good architect, not the likes of Bovis and cookie cutter [REDACTED] that litters the countryside.

(R208/session 53703; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Traditional in keeping with W Sussex

(R154/session 53708; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

I would like it to follow the look and especially the colour of the existing building. If bricks, they should be the colour of the cliffs. No synthetic colourful accents, leave that to nature. In terms of traditional vs contemporary, I'm not sure what either would look like in this context but something like the newly built Hillfort House in Brighton is a great compromise.

(R203/session 53949; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

Either, but not just boxes, lets have some curves, and no more grey (please)

(R181/session 54012; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

the new buildings on site should reflect the historical industrial previous use of the site.

(R90/session 54020; member of public)

Created **June 10th 2022**

Whatever the style it must complement the natural elements surrounding it. High quality design preferred, not 70s housing estate!

(R112/session 54076; member of public)

Created **June 11th 2022**

A wild approach, to showcase the very best of chalkland wildlife.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)

Created **June 11th 2022**

Prefer no new buildings

(R94/session 54186; member of public)

Created **June 13th 2022**

Traditional would suit the area better, I think. But some modern features in other areas of the UK are both interesting and eye-catching

(R142/session 54348; member of public)

Created **June 14th 2022**

Traditional

(R166/session 54370; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

Traditional

(R216/session 54416; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

Both

(R78/session 54414; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

The architectural design should maximise the number of small houses and flats.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)

Created **June 16th 2022**

Contemporary

(R119/session 54505; member of public)

Created **June 17th 2022**

Mixture

(R209/session 54553; member of public)

Created **June 19th 2022**

contemporary

(R145/session 54557; member of public)
Created **June 19th 2022**

I would prefer a mixture of traditional and contemporary building styles

(R164/session 54096; member of public)
Created **June 21st 2022**

traditional

(R139/session 54943; member of public)
Created **June 24th 2022**

Definitely contemporary. What an opportunity to produce something modern as it is a self contained site and doesn't have to fit in with any existing buildings

(R173/session 54989; member of public)
Created **June 25th 2022**

contemporary

(R186/session 55093; member of public)
Created **June 28th 2022**

Something that complements the area, not too radical in design so as to detract from the beautiful surroundings but modern in the sense that it would need to be energy efficient and built using sustainable methods and design.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)
Created **June 29th 2022**

We do not feel strongly about design as long as the most energy efficient construction is used and all opportunities to use natural power are incorporated eg ground source heat pumps, insulation, solar energy etc. Indeed it could be a showcase for sustainable design.

(R108/session 55212; member of public)
Created **July 1st 2022**

Contemporary and future proofed - so a sustainable green build

(R172/session 55230; member of public)
Created **July 2nd 2022**

sympathetic to landscape, rather than trad or contemporary.

(R117/session 55250; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

Eco friendly architecture such as grass rooves and solar panels. Use local materials.

(R205/session 55260; member of public)
Created July 3rd 2022

Contemporary. The Zedbed scheme is an example of sustainability in design.

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

Traditional

(R179/session 55304; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

As so much of the site is hidden from view, I don't think its important to falsely create traditional architecture. One could describe the existing buildings as "traditional" and we don't want them.

(R149/session 55308; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

Mixture of both

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

Neither. No buildings

(R183/session 55368; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

I'm happy to go with the architects' view on what would work best. I'm an Amex stadium lover but I also love the more traditional brick and flint architecture of parts Sompting, Beeding, Ovingdean etc.

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Contemporary

(R175/session 55405; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

depends on the design

(R169/session 55398; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

I would like to see a traditional approach, but some contemporary work could be incorporated if it is 'in keeping' rather than overwhelming.

(R104/session 55482; member of public)
Created July 9th 2022

Contemporary. I think it's important to show how developing sites like this can help us look forward, and inspire excitement within visitors.

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

Mixture of both, not imposing

(R176/session 56372; member of public)
Created July 16th 2022

Traditional

(R140/session 55534; member of public)
Created July 17th 2022

Mixture.

(R136/session 56490; member of public)
Created July 18th 2022

Contemporary only.

(R107/session 56637; member of public)
Created July 19th 2022

Mixture

(R187/session 56735; member of public)
Created July 20th 2022

Mixture is OK as long as it respects and complements and draws on local vernacular architecture, and uses local materials such as flint and brick.

(R75/session 56810; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

A mixture

(R207/session 56817; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

Both

(R141/session 56885; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

The would be room for both. The residential area might reflect the architecture of the original work force housing along the A283, and this should be preserved on the riverside area. The 'bowl' area should be stone and brick, and no more than 2-3 floors high, allowing a natural gradient to rise towards the east end of the site,

(R168/session 56899; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

There is opportunity for a sensitive mix of architectural styles, depending upon uses and locations within the site as a whole. On the Riverside site there could be a nod towards Sussex vernacular architecture, working towards a more modern approach on the Cement Works area

(R159/session 56908; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

i accept that housing may have to be built on the riverside part but i would not want to see housing or office/commercial development taking the place of the wild and exciting ruins that are there currently. any building should be a fantastic design that is sympathetic to what is currently there and green/carbon neutral

(R152/session 56938; member of public)
Created July 24th 2022

mixture

(R182/session 57984; Kingsley Parish Council, Hampshire)
Created July 25th 2022

Traditional, in keeping with the other nearby homes and the proposed new landscape.

(R79/session 56961; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

whatever is the best for blending into the landscape

(R195/session 56984; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Mixture

(R174/session 56998; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Whatever is architecturally most appropriate

(R101/session 56990; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

contemporary

(R212/session 57028; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

A mixture

(R184/session 57024; member of public)

Created July 25th 2022

If temporary, it doesn't significantly matter, certainly not long-term, as enabling development should enable the full restoration of the quarry.

(R103/session 56917; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

Whether it be contemporary or traditional the architectural design should be focused on the needs of people whether it be in their home or working environment. They must not feel alienated from their surroundings.

(R221/session 57159; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

Contemporary

(R124/session 57177; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

Contemporary using landscape sensitive materials such as wood cladding and sedum roofs

(R116/session 57216; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

mixture

(R211/session 57853; member of public)

Created July 27th 2022

A mixture of both is acceptable so long as it is of a high quality and inclusive design based on a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental and policy context for the development. Good design is a key element in a sustainable development. This approach should ensure that developments in the Parish promote a high standard of urban design, architecture and landscape. Development will be required to enhance and protect the locally distinctive characters, through good design, landscaping (both within a scheme and having regard to the impact on surrounding landscapes), creating a 'sense of place', and in ensuring that local, social and environmental characteristics are considered. We need to ensure that development is of high quality, well designed and takes account of the existing character of the area.

(R156/session 57287; member of public)

Created July 27th 2022

Mixture

(R192/session 57319; member of public)

Created July 28th 2022

utility design

(R84/session 57491; member of public)

Created July 29th 2022

traditional

(R128/session 57501; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Contemporary with ecological practicalities - grassed roof, solar panels, etc.

(R165/session 57543; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Contemporary and or modern interpretation. Materiality should be progressive and net zero. A mock traditional development would be a travesty.

(R99/session 57553; Findon Parish Council)
Created July 29th 2022

6. The approach to architectural design should incorporate a mix of traditional and contemporary.

(R132/session 57586; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Contemporary however taking inspiration from the landscape. The hills should be the dominating feature, not any buildings on the site unless it is part of a working museum.

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

If contemporary means ugly concrete buildings, no. Well designed eco buildings reflecting the Victorian houses in Dacre Gardens, yes. Maybe a more contemporary, well designed, style by the riverside.

(R137/session 57747; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Traditional, to fit in with the local housing stock - Dacre Gardens, etc.

(R115/session 57760; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Just not bog standard housing development design

(R77/session 57764; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

One that blends in with local environment i.e free roofs, use of chalk structures. See Baker Brown architecture in Cooksbridge, East Sussex

(R82/session 57785; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

A mixture

(R76/session 57798; member of public)
Created **July 30th 2022**

I think filling this site with homogeneous dull buildings would be a dereliction of your duties as a national park, we're in a climate crisis, please be brave, don't develop & re-wild.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)
Created **July 31st 2022**

Mixture - perhaps contemporary on one side of the road and more traditional on the other

(R220/session 57858; member of public)
Created **July 31st 2022**

Mixture

(R96/session 57924; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Not applicable - this is narrow thinking as outlined in Q5

(R126/session 57939; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Neither

(R130/session 57941; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Mix of both

(R87/session 57957; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Mixture

(R163/session 57979; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Which ever approach can be done economically and sustainably

(R158/session 57982; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

mixture

(R143/session 57986; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Contemporary design, embracing the best environmentally friendly technology. The important focus is HIGH QUALITY ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN. Please, please avoid the errors that Adur District Council and others have made over the decades, by insisting upon dreadful pastiche recreations of old architecture.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Traditional. Contemporary would just make it seem even more sterile and detached from the SDNP.

(R162/session 57996; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

None rewild it

(R69/session 60913; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

I think a mixture, but reflecting local character - very high construction standards and life cycle analyst required or all building and infrastructure design

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)
Created August 2nd 2022

While there are many lessons from shockingly poor architecture everywhere, including domestic and business premises in and adjacent to the Park and the SCW, appropriate design sensitive to place and purpose should be the aim, allied to attracting a new audience to the wonders of our National Parks. To some extent, as well as constituting the largest development site in the SDNP, the SCW development will test any National Park's ability to develop industrial 'rural scars' close to urban settings with housing and other pressures. Indeed the national interest may be invoked and terms like 'iconic' may surface on such a key site.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)
Created August 2nd 2022

We do not feel strongly about design as long as the most energy efficient construction is used and all opportunities to use natural power are incorporated eg ground source heat pumps, insulation, solar energy etc. Indeed it could be a showcase for sustainable, and wherever possible, nature-based design.

(R20/session 60856; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

I would like to see something individual and unique. Shoreham-by-sea has recently seen lots of new development riverside, and most is very ugly, unimaginative and unexciting and adds nothing to what was a quaint fishing village.

(R50/session 60893; SDNPA Specialists Team)
Created August 2nd 2022

Contemporary yes, but good quality materials and architecture, different from vernacular.
Not mix of traditional and contemporary.

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

A mixture of both contemporary and traditional is acceptable so long as it is of a high quality and inclusive design based on a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental and policy context for the development. • Good design is a key element in a sustainable development. This approach should ensure that developments in UBPC promote a high standard of urban design, architecture and landscape. • Development should enhance and protect the locally distinctive character through good design, landscaping (both within a scheme and having regard to the impact on surrounding landscapes). • A 'sense of place' must be created, whilst ensuring that local, social and environmental characteristics are considered.

(R67/session 60911; Whaleback)
Created August 2nd 2022

We support the use of contemporary architecture, as the site is removed any established vernacular in the wider area. There are areas of the site that would benefit from a traditional approach and potential retention of existing building to reflect the cultural heritage of the cement works.

(R72/session 60917; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

No development of any sort

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

See response for Q.5

(R11/session 60846; Cyrrus Brighton City Airport)
Created August 2nd 2022

Brighton City Airport has no preferences with the style of architecture to be used at the site. However, given that the site is within the 13Km bird circle associated to the airport. It is important that the building/roof structures are designed so that they are unattractive to birds. Buildings may be used by birds depending upon the design and use of the buildings and the availability of food in the nearby environment. Pigeons, starlings and gulls are the most common birds hazardous to aviation to be found in and around buildings. Pigeons make use of ledges of buildings to roost whilst starlings may roost both on and in buildings in vast numbers. Gantries and other complex structures offer potential perches and gulls are increasingly nesting on flat and shallow pitched roofs. 'Green' & 'brown' roofs can also be very attractive to birds. Brighton City Airport would therefore encourage that the buildings are designed to minimise bird attraction. Please be aware that subject to the final designs a Bird Hazard Management Plan might have to added to the life of the site following consultation with the airport at the formal planning stage.

(R91/session 55861; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

It might vary across the site depending on the aim of each aspect. For example: retaining the character of the chimney as the icon landmark feels important. But any new housing, visitor centres or workspaces, should be built to a standard that is carbon/climate positive in its build quality and purpose.

(R127/session 53652; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

It depends what is meant by these terms, however I think a bit of a mix could create a really dynamic development. It would be nice to put in unique features of the National Park in the redevelopment.

(R223/session 58070; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Contemporary but with a nod to the historic industrial aspects.

(R224/session 58050; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

A mixture of both

Question 7: What type of public space, such as public squares, pocket parks and skateboard parks, would you like to see and why?

(R206/session 53526; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Free public access to the river

(R214/session 53542; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

I would like any such developments to be discreetly positioned and to be appropriately furnished with necessary facilities to ensure security, cleanliness and a generally pleasant experience for both visitors and those who utilise these areas. I would wish for at least some of the green areas to be dog friendly and there to be adequate facilities for all age groups and for the disabled. Water features and spaces are aesthetically pleasing and beneficial to wildlife - and should be included in the planned development, together with adequate tree/shrub planting to enhance both the landscape and biodiversity.

(R196/session 53606; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

NO skateboard parks. Open, welcoming futuristic places.

(R197/session 53690; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

A nice cafe / restaurant with decent coffee would be amazing! The areas is seriously lacking in this type of sector, but it would require supporting infrastructure, such as footpaths and bus stops. Skateparks would be cool also. And nice to have a safe space for children. There are already a number of public spaces and village halls so that feels covered. Something like BOAT in Brighton might be nice, given the amphitheatre aspect. This could then be used as a creative space for arts performances.

(R208/session 53703; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Parks, nature trails, lakes, dedicated cycle lanes away from people and dogs. Dedicated skate-board parks, if we have to!

(R154/session 53708; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

I would like the bowl area maintained as a public park.

(R203/session 53949; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

Plenty of dog free park space, let children have the space for a change

(R90/session 54020; member of public)

Created June 10th 2022

Specific use public spaces amongst homes like village hall general use type facility, playing fields, allotments, walking trails, play areas etc. They lower the housing density and create places and communities as opposed to housing estates.

(R112/session 54076; member of public)

Created June 11th 2022

Nothing but wildlife, because the SDNP is depleted of wildlife.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)

Created June 11th 2022

Public areas, viewing points, bird hides, cafe / restaurant,

(R94/session 54186; member of public)

Created June 13th 2022

Given that the overall plan must be to provide greater access and enjoyment of our local countryside, I would suggest that if there is a demand for a particular use, it should be considered.

(R142/session 54348; member of public)

Created June 14th 2022

Skate park, public park. As it needs to provide entertainment for both young and old people.

(R216/session 54416; member of public)

Created June 15th 2022

Indoor Ski and ice skating centre

(R78/session 54414; member of public)

Created June 15th 2022

No skateboard park is needed. The site is fortunately adjacent to the Downs Link and the focus should be on the inclusion of cycle paths from all areas of the site to that Link. The design should maximise the number of homes on the site.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)

Created June 16th 2022

I would like to see this developed as a major visitor attraction for the public to visit, rather than a public park etc.

(R119/session 54505; member of public)

Created June 17th 2022

Green spaces with trees, benches, outdoor wooden play area (rustic), outdoor theatre, cafe

(R209/session 54553; member of public)
Created June 19th 2022

none

(R145/session 54557; member of public)
Created June 19th 2022

A major attraction like a mini-Eden centre , plus Go-Ape type of activity are required to attract tourists.

(R145/session 54557; member of public)
Created June 19th 2022

Emphasis should be on tourist attractions like mini-Eden, Go-Ape/Zips with some public amenities

(R164/session 54096; member of public)
Created June 21st 2022

Nature reserve with restaurants /cafe

(R139/session 54943; member of public)
Created June 24th 2022

A public space like a village green to encourage community feeling

(R173/session 54989; member of public)
Created June 25th 2022

As natural environment as possible. A skateboard park although necessary in urban areas doesn't seem applicable here due to it being a low population area. An adventure park could work - zip wires etc.

(R186/session 55093; member of public)
Created June 28th 2022

It would be wonderful to see this space used by the local community. It's a 15 minute cycle ride from Shoreham and I can see families cycling up and stopping off for a picnic, or to visit whatever is there if it's publicly accessible. Something for local teenagers to enjoy would be particularly useful as there isn't much for them locally which causes problems. As well as homes and office space, I'd really love there to be a spa hotel in Shoreham - we don't have anything of the sort nearby and it's a crying shame.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)
Created June 29th 2022

We would like public spaces that promote inclusion, biodiversity and community

(R108/session 55212; member of public)
Created July 1st 2022

similar to eden project to reflect the south downs and the bio diversity to include South Downs Centre. Ski /climbing centre/ Riverside restaurant

(R172/session 55230; member of public)
Created July 2nd 2022

all of the above with access from the Downs link

(R117/session 55250; member of public)
Created July 3rd 2022

Parks and orchards not hard surfaces using concrete. Ponds.

(R205/session 55260; member of public)
Created July 3rd 2022

Some of the most attractive public spaces are rewilded land. Biodiversity itself is an major attraction. People want to see more nature. Facilities that enable this, e.g bird hides, will attract visitors who will be sensitive to the land.

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

None, as I don't think there should be any residential use of the site

(R179/session 55304; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

The amphitheatre would lend itself to a performance arena

(R149/session 55308; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

Walking trails, dog walking areas, cycle paths, kids play grounds (very important) & skatepark, outside splash pad, cafe, pond or similar (much like Southwater country park) mini golf, toilets, lots of seating areas. There isn't much like this in the surrounding Shoreham area. If more housing is to be built in Shoreham it is vitally important that outside public spaces AND public facilities are made available also (schools, Drs surgeries, shops etc) Maybe a leisure park with cinema, bowling, shopping & restaurants would be nice also.

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

None. Our area is saturated with housing and traffic congestion. Any development of this site will make things worse not better.

(R183/session 55368; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Depends on the planned land use but I would like to maximise green space and also to

reflect the differing nature of the 5 areas for development, in particular those areas with a tranquil, natural nature.

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Public space should accompany any industrial units or housing, but with the right access to the adjacent countryside there is no need for 'play' areas, per se

(R175/session 55405; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

as green and undeveloped as possible

(R169/session 55398; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

As I said earlier, a project similar to the Eden Project could and should incorporate some public areas like picnic areas and children's playgrounds.

(R133/session 55416; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Ski/snow dome, mountain bike park. Leisure

(R104/session 55482; member of public)
Created July 9th 2022

Hopefully a combination of all these things. Particularly facilities that make use of the landscape. Mountain biking, skate boarding, zip lines (similar to zip world in Wales), go ape style activities, electric scooter trails etc.

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

As many leisure facilities as possible. Look at tilgate Park, pembrey Country park in Wales, moors Valley.

(R140/session 55534; member of public)
Created July 17th 2022

Small parks and squares OK.

(R136/session 56490; member of public)
Created July 18th 2022

Consideration should be given on how to attract people to the site, so e.g. skate park / BMX track would be great - as long as there's facilities and parking to support them. Some of the Bowl ecosystem and all of the cliffland ecosystem should be retained.

(R107/session 56637; member of public)
Created July 19th 2022

The higher the number of houses that form part of the plan, the more significant such features become. As a residential development, this site is relatively isolated and it will be important to ensure that there are amenities available, particularly for younger members of the community.

(R187/session 56735; member of public)
Created July 20th 2022

Trees, trees, trees. Given the recent heatwave and the impact of climate change, safe and cool spaces could become crucial. As little concrete as possible. Parks and green spaces. Please, no mountain bikes, zip lines and toboggans. Have seen cycle practice circuits in a park in Stratford on Avon. Cycle trails good but macho biking trails less good for me. Walking trails, outdoor exercise equipment.

(R75/session 56810; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

None. This site should be a regional recycling/waste disposal/energy producing facility. EG. Line the Northern cliffs with solar panels.

(R207/session 56817; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

The layout of the ship: The Hull / Bilge – Bottom of the ship. The stern. Swimming pool (decent size including a wave pool). Kids pool with slides. Access to outside pool & rapids. Sauna/Hot tub/Steam room. The Bow. Ice-Skating Rink / Curling The Orlop – Lower Deck. Dance Halls ... Ballet etc... (fencing) Fitness Classes. i.e., Yoga/ Pilates Ten Pin Bowling Squash Court Gym Trampoline Roller Blading Soft Play / Sensory Room Sports Massage Facilities. Gallery. Restaurant (looking over to Shoreham). Captain's Cabin – Offices Main Deck – Booking Office (Main Entrance) Walk the Plank to Exit – for the car park! Outside the Pirates ship 1. Dry Ski Slopes / Snow Boarding. 1A Cable Car ...(The Moonscape) 2. Tobogganing 3. Wave Garden / Surf ... (The Bowl - emergency Reservoir) 4. Zip Wire 5. Wall Climbing 6. Skate Park 7. Running Track 8. Tennis Courts 9. Football Pitches (Grass & Astro) 10. Bike hire for cycling on Southdown's 11. Boules Green. Car Park. Bus Transport to & from Shoreham Train Station. Hotel – over the road Mission: Provide a fun-loving place to enjoy living life to the full. Encourage everyone that healthy living isn't a chore! Create a healthy environment for mind and body. Provide affordable activities for everyone's age and ability with services around their needs. My passion is that everyone believes in themselves and makes the most out of life. My dream is to have a vast number of activities under one roof, where variety is the spice of life. .

(R141/session 56885; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

There is ample opportunity for public spaces - but skateboard parks are often empty and cater for a very narrow demographic range. The South Downs would benefit from a fully developed artificial/green ski slope for use all the year round - and would fit with the kind of leisure based commercial activity in the 'Bowl' area. There is no other facility south of the Thames.

(R168/session 56899; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

The site as a whole has the potential to become a key feature and 'destination' within the National Park for leisure and recreation, given its location adjacent to the very popular Downs Link path and the A283. There is safe, largely traffic free, active travel opportunity

for residents of local villages and towns close to the Downs Link. (subject to some infrastructure improvements such as path widening and better surfacing). There will also be a need for public space for residents of new housing on the site and for workers at new businesses, as well as for visitors to the site. To meet these needs the Riverside presents a great opportunity to provide relaxation areas by way of an area of parkland adjacent to the Downs Link with facilities for sitting, picnics, cafe. The Bowl could accommodate facilities for active recreation - such as skateboarding / BMX (bearing in mind the rise in interest due to success in the Tokyo Olympics) as well as an Mountain Biking area. The Cement Works area, if partly developed for housing, could have a more formal hard landscape style of open spaces.

(R159/session 56908; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

the wild, secluded feeling should be preserved and possibly enhanced (with nature) it would be nice for the public to be able to visit to enjoy the unique atmosphere, unobtrusive walking routes or planted nature gardens to sit and enjoy, maybe a small cafe

(R152/session 56938; member of public)
Created July 24th 2022

I would like to see a definite centre to the development, including a public square, retail and services

(R182/session 57984; Kingsley Parish Council, Hampshire)
Created July 25th 2022

Social meeting spaces for both adults and children to enjoy their leisure time in a safe and vehicle free environment. This approach should give rise to a greater community feel to the location.

(R79/session 56961; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

play parks, restful places, picnic areas with brick bbqs,

(R195/session 56984; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Small areas suitable for different uses. Skateboard parks (and other things) available otherwise not attractive for families and boring place for teenagers.

(R174/session 56998; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

This is very much personal preference so Lancing College will not comment on this

(R212/session 57028; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Public spaces should relate to the previous use of the site whilst providing public amenity

(R184/session 57024; member of public)

Created July 25th 2022

Open access in a nature-recovered chalk grassland landscape, a re-imagined, visionary, exemplary, sustainable South Downs dry coombe. Why would you want to encourage car-borne traffic to this site with skateboard and other such parks?

(R103/session 56917; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

Although the chalk will make up the underlying sub-strata trees, bushes, meadow and grass must be used to soften the whole area. Human scale walkways, parks and water features must be incorporated into the design.

(R221/session 57159; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

Public squares, pocket parks and a world class competition standard skateboard park. It is an ideal setting for the latter and make to site a go to destination.

(R124/session 57177; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

I think the riverfront area should be public space with no structures except seats and maybe a jetty, my main overall concern is minimising vehicular traffic overall

(R116/session 57216; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

all

(R211/session 57853; member of public)

Created July 27th 2022

One of the key issues identified in the UBPC Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was the limited availability of facilities for sports and leisure in the area. Therefore, there is a great opportunity to provide development for leisure and tourism uses, including recreational accommodation, restaurants, theatres, arts, ecological and educational facilities. These to include: South Downs Visitor Centre with parks, camp site, shops, cafe, youth hostel, stables, and cycle centre. A sports centre to include: gym, ice skating, ski slope, swimming pool, rock climbing, water sports, zip wire, mountain boarding, skate boarding, should be considered. A Music centre / studios & practice venue.

(R156/session 57287; member of public)

Created July 27th 2022

I think parks, woodland or Riverside walks and access to the river would be important

(R192/session 57319; member of public)

Created July 28th 2022

these can be provided in existing communities at less cost

(R84/session 57491; member of public)

Created July 29th 2022

skateboard park and bike bmx park

(R128/session 57501; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

It's a great place to meet along the downs link. Adequate parking for walkers/cyclists etc. an environmental centre for school trips and walkers etc. about the South Downs - including history, nature, art etc. perhaps sports facilities, upper beeding doesn't have a huge amount of these for the local community - a gym, areas for exercise classes, swimming pool.

(R165/session 57543; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

A verdant green infrastructure throughout is essential. Placemaking to come first that balances ecology, flooding, existing heritage and health wellbeing. Architecture should come after and be proportional in offer once green infrastructure is secured.

(R99/session 57553; Findon Parish Council)
Created July 29th 2022

7. Ideally public spaces should include a nature reserve, heritage exhibition/educational centre and open shared green spaces, riverside walks and other clearly signed walking trails linking where possible to existing PROWs

(R132/session 57586; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Pocket parks, picnic areas, walking and cycling areas and water features.

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

All of the above, with lots of indigenous trees. The site needs to become a community, not a dormitory. I would also suggest a community centre and 'good' shops, nursery, small businesses etc.

(R137/session 57747; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Plenty of open spaces for public use with seating areas and a possible skate park and local amenities such as a children's play park and small swimming/paddling pool.

(R115/session 57760; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Lots of green - why a skatepark- really inaccessible for young people

(R77/session 57764; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Only what is required for residents. This shouldn't be a destination site for people to visit but instead an exemplar on how you can mix housing for the local community with green-based industries using local conditions. E.g. using river to shuttle to Shoreham. Using the

massings to develop vertical farming and geothermal energy.

(R82/session 57785; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Parkland, walking trails, sensitively but safely fenced for the protection of children and animals. Minimum hard landscaping but perhaps some artistic commissions. Possibly a performance venue using a re-landscaped bowl.

(R76/session 57798; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

None of these.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

As much public space as possible

(R96/session 57924; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

The public space should have access opportunities related to a habitat restoration plan. Walking, picnicing and even cycling are all potential opportunities, the latter potentially linking in with the Downslink

(R126/session 57939; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Information boards on the history of the site and wildlife.

(R130/session 57941; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Yes please to all! I'd prefer to see leisure facilities rather than extensive house/ business building love to see a state of the art skateboard park, a super modern style minigolf (See Jurassic Falls Adventure Golf, London.) A zipwire . A small indoor sports centre to cater for "niche" sports such as Handball, and Padel Tennis, (an up and coming popular sport, to serve the south coast!) Maybe a small swimming pool/ Jacuzzi/ sauna and steamroom.

(R87/session 57957; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Squares, cafes, outdoor playpark (rustic)

(R163/session 57979; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Lots of park space and public use space. This should be a place for all people to visit to use rather than just any residents.

(R158/session 57982; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

restoration of areas for wildlife with walk ways and wildlife observation areas (as per RSPB reserves)

(R143/session 57986; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

The beauty of this site is that it is rural, in the middle of the Downs. This is not a site for concrete skateboard ramps. I'd really like to see open green space and areas of habitat which ramp around some of the mixed-use (restaurant / coffee shop / small hotel / local museum / crafts) which encourage people to visit. Also an open green space which is sculptured as an outdoor amphitheatre for local / community use... think the Minack Theatre.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Lakes, cycle routes, SDNP heritage visitor centre (along lines of Seven Sisters CP), downland flora and fauna showcase, preservation and enhancement of existing natural assets such as cliff bird nesting sites. River frontage development for major revenue-generating leisure activities: e.g: kayaking and boating.

(R162/session 57996; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

None rewild it

(R66/session 60910; West Sussex County Council (WSCC))
Created **August 2nd 2022**

All public spaces should be linked by non-motorised routes that allow for a multitude of users, i.e., pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. Bridleways provide this.

(R69/session 60913; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

I like the idea of a sequential experience - I would strongly advocate an emphasis on STEM experience as part of outcome 6.1

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

The site must primarily be seen as a 'greened' site within the Park rather than a housing development site. This is not the place for a new village or hamlet nor an extension, however sympathetic, to the terrace of workers' and manager's housing adjacent to the site. Surely only rural style development with modern wooden picnic tables and benches on nature regenerated sites, will be the aim. In relation to leisure, we presume the emphasis will be on active rural leisure activities than sport facilities; skateboard parks, tennis and sports facilities would be inappropriate.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

We would like public spaces that promote inclusion, biodiversity and community with a thought to how space can also be left for nature, such as pocket reserves for small

species and nesting birds

(R20/session 60856; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

The Riverside should be celebrated. The Downslink is very popular, but is congested and problematic around the cement works. The existing owner has erected ugly brutalistic fencing, rather than something softer such as Sussex post and rail. The Downslink is encroached by this fencing and feels very narrow in places. What would be welcome is a new route towards Mill Hill/Truleigh Hill. A diagonal cut through through Eringham towards Southwick/Holmbush/Happy Valley? Park space with good views via Mill Hill away from the noise of the A283 would be welcome, and other sanctuaries to escape noise. If one walks to the back of the winds of the nearby Anchor bottom, quietude can be reached. There is opportunity for sound muffled space.

(R50/session 60893; SDNPA Specialists Team)

Created August 2nd 2022

A mix of all, integrated in nature, varied depending on function and uses within the site. Public space should be characteristic in landscape terms and multifunctional.

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

One of the key issues identified in the UBPC Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was the limited availability of facilities for sports and leisure in the area. • Therefore, there is a great opportunity to provide development for leisure and tourism uses, including recreational accommodation, restaurants, theatres, arts, ecological and educational facilities. • These to include: South Downs Visitor Centre with parks, camp site, shops, cafe, youth hostel, stables, and cycle centre. • A sports centre to include: gym, ice skating, ski slope, swimming pool, rock climbing, water sports, zip wire, mountain boarding, skate boarding, should be considered. • A Music centre / studios & practice venue.

(R67/session 60911; Whaleback)

Created August 2nd 2022

The moonscape and bowl offer large areas for public open space and especially if land is undevelopable due to contamination could be returned to a more natural habitat. In terms of playspace, we support the initiatives of 'Make Space for Girls'- a campaigning group that seeks to improve public spaces for teenage girls- see their research findings here: <https://makespaceforgirls.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Make-Space-for-Girls-Summary-ofResearch-findings-December-2020-web.pdf>

(R72/session 60917; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

The cement works has been identified through ecological surveys as already home to protected species and has the potential to become habitat of principle importance, so absolutely "NO" to any skate parks when there is already an beautiful natural wildlife open space.

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

A variety of public open space typologies are encouraged to meet the needs of residents and visitors, and could be addressed through the design code process referred to above.

For information, Adur District Council updated its Public Open Space Study in 2019. It is important to balance redeveloped areas with the needs for residents by providing place-based opportunities to improve the quality of life (e.g. recreational activities).

(R11/session 60846; Cyrrus Brighton City Airport)
Created August 2nd 2022

Where a proposed development is within 13Km of an Aerodrome, the introduction of soft landscaping schemes could have the potential to attract birds and increase the bird strike risk to Brighton City Airport. Brighton City Airport would therefore encourage further consultation on any Landscape proposals prior to any formal planning being submitted. As a quick guide Brighton City Airport would stipulate the following to be incorporated into any future landscape proposals. • Stands of trees with the potential to provide canopies for bird species such as Rooks, Crows should be planted at 4 metre centres or greater. • Tree species such as Oak (*Quercus* sp.) Scots Pine (*Pinus Sylvestris*), and Beech (*Fagus Sylvatica*) should be excluded from the planting scheme. • Large quantities of berry bearing species should be avoided. If they are essential to the integrity of the proposed planting scheme, low numbers of berry bearing plants may be dispersed amongst other non berry species to reduce the total food supply for birds. In this location, berry bearing species should be kept below 20% of the total planting palette. • No areas of open water should be introduced to the site.

(R10/session 60845; Cycling UK Brighton and Hove)
Created August 2nd 2022

Public space should be accessible to all, but motor vehicles should not be welcome. The presence of car parks and motor vehicle movements takes up space and introduces very real risks to people who are walking/cycling/wheeling. There should be adequate, secure, visible and easily accessible safe cycle parking at all destination points. Movement through the development should be easy and logical for those walking/cycling/wheeling. Modes should be segregated, as recommended in modern evidence-based guidance supplied by government and referenced in this letter. 3.6.3. Movement We strongly support points (a) to (d) to improve active travel and non-motorised transport (pasted below). a) Sustainable means to travel to and from the site to be prioritised over private vehicle use. b) Active travel infrastructure and facilities should be provided within the site, which should be well connected to and integrated in the wider network. This includes fast, safe and accessible sustainable travel routes to the nearby settlements of Shoreham-by-Sea, Upper Beeding and Steyning including Shoreham-by-Sea railway station, in support of intermodal journeys; this could include a shuttle bus to the train station. c) Bus stops within the development and on the A283 should be accessible and effectively sheltered. d) Non-motorised connections with the nearby public right of way network should be maximised, including the Downs Link and the South Downs Way. Whilst the Action Plan makes many good points in this section, regarding point (e) "Vehicular access and parking should make an efficient use of land, minimising landscape impact, avoiding encroachment onto existing buildings worthy of retention and areas that are suitable for development, where possible.", we would like to see a much more determined exploration of car-free development in the first instance. In any case, motor vehicle access and parking should be at an absolute minimum because many of the negative impacts cannot actually be effectively mitigated. This is relevant to points f, l, j and k where highway "improvements" e.g. on the A283 are mentioned. Highway "improvements" is a loaded term because the endless increase in road capacity has been a major cause of biodiversity loss, community severance and a barrier to active travel. Most people cite motor vehicle danger as the reason they do not cycle. Highway "changes" would be a more accurate description. We would very much like to see the Downs Link improved for walkers and cyclists between Shoreham and Bramber and brought more in line with the original railway route, with a modern replacement bridge for people cycling/walking/wheeling/horse riding and an at-grade toucan/pegasus crossing south of Bramber. Improving the A283 underpass for walking and cycling would be welcome as in point (g). I understand that the A283 between

the Bramber roundabout and the Horsham Road junction north of Steyning is currently subject to a council speed review. We are strongly in support of slower speeds across the board to reduce danger to people cycling/walking/wheeling/horse riding who might be using a road or crossing a road. The 60 mph default National Speed Limit is much too high for rural roads. There has been a 21% increase in people killed or seriously injured (KSIs) on Sussex roads in 2021/22. This equates to 19 more deaths and 52 more serious injuries than 2020/21. Nationally, deaths of cyclists on rural roads have increased, and speeding is implicated. It must be acknowledged that people make cycling and walking journeys that are outside of, and beyond National Cycle Network provision. This is particularly relevant if the Shoreham Cement Works site is to become a sustainable tourism destination, attracting people from a wider area. Much of the National Cycle Network has been declassified (e.g. much of the Brighton to London NCN20 route) as a Sustrans cycle route due to failing the national audit conducted by Sustrans (<https://www.sustrans.org.uk/about-us/paths-for-everyone/reclassification-of-the-national-cycle-network-faqs>). Sections of routes are too narrow, obstructed, on roads with high speed limits or with poor surfaces and inadequate maintenance. One of our members was hit by a motorbike as she cycled from Steyning towards Partridge Green across the A283. We would like to see that junction signalised, and greater attention given to dangers due to speeding motor vehicles across West Sussex. It is unclear what is meant by "Shared/communal and multifunctional parking facilities" in point (k) In point (l) which says: "EV charging points and cycle storage should be available to all occupiers and visitors of the development." It is important to note the difference between cycle parking and cycle storage, and also to include e-bikes in EV charging point arrangements. "Car free" development is relevant to paragraph 5.75 (below) which we strongly support. The distinction between vehicles and motor vehicles needs to be made clear. In English law a cycle is a vehicle. 5.75 Any redevelopment will need to be matched by substantial investment in sustainable transport, for example, increasing the frequency and accessibility of the existing bus service. Providing car clubs could reduce private car use and there may also be scope to make parts of the site 'car-free' and have parking hubs. Making connections to the South Downs Way and Downs Link will be crucial for promoting walking and cycling links to the wider countryside and nearby settlements. We would like to see the car-free potential of this site properly explored, not relegated to a small area. Public transport such as a frequent bus service will be essential to achieve modal change.

(R91/session 55861; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Lot's of green spaces, and places for community gathering would be essential. Community gardens, nature trails with good access to the coast and Downs would enrich the lives of locals and visitors alike. However, within the residential area scope should also be made for younger residents to have spaces they enjoy - skate parks, Adventure playground, outdoor gym etc?

(R127/session 53652; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

As much as possible. People need outside space, and a diverse use of spaces too. People tend to steer away from skate parks as they imagine it creates 'anti social behaviour'. But when I was young I would walk nearly 2 miles in my town to my nearest skate park, as I enjoyed it as a teenager for the actual skating aspect. Plus the feel of community and socialising.

(R185/session 57963; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

With regard to paragraph 3.6.7(d) we would support the extensive implementation of SuDS in public spaces in order to manage surface water in a more sustainable way; to slow the

flow, and reduce the problems that can be caused by rapid runoff from impermeable surfaces.

(R223/session 58070; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

Public parks/squares should be integral to the design creating shared open and green space for those living and working there. Leisure parks (skateboard, outdoor gym) should form a part of this rather than being segregated.

(R224/session 58050; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

How about keeping the heritage of the buildings, turning them into a site for botanical gardens (factory as a greenhouse?!), with a degree of re-wilding, parkland and a connection to the downs? I don't particularly mind including public venues such as the theatre example in Sweden but they would need to be sensitive to the location and not too commercial.